REMARKS

I. Status of the Claims

Claims 1-20 are pending.

Claims 1-20 stand rejected.

Claims 1, 2, 6-9, 11, 14, 16, 18 and 20 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claim 5 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter therein.

II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-4 and 6-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,490,663 to Komori ("Komori") and claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Komori in view of EP 0903271 to Funakoshi ("Funakoshi"). The Examiner states that Komori discloses all of the features of the claimed invention except for a delay portion. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 6-9, 11, 14, 16, 18 and 20 have been amended to include the elements of rejected claim 5 and the Applicant traverses the Examiner's rejection accordingly. Applicant submits that Komori, either alone or in combination with Funakoshi, does not teach or suggest the present invention. Firstly, Applicant agrees with the Examiner that Komori does not teach or suggest a delay portion. Step S201 in Figure 4 of Komori illustrates that Komori does not disclose whether or not a command is inputted and what command is inputted. In Komori, a period of time to wait is clearly not determined because it does not have a uniform result. In essence, since the step is not waiting for what it opted for is not a delay time even assuming it is in a waiting state. In contrast to Komori, Applicant's present invention provides a delay portion in that the regular command (the writing after the KEY collation) is delayed during a predetermined time (10 seconds).

Additionally, although Funakoshi performs a type of KEY collation it does not take into consideration delay time since a program is not written in and thus actually teaches away from the combination with Komori. Thus, the elements of the present invention that the collation is being refused on a continuous basis during the delay time is clearly not disclosed by Funakoshi. Moreover, should one combine Komori, which does not establish delay as a control, and Funakoshi, which teaches away from incorporating delay time and simply teaches collation, the relation between the timing that can be written in, the delay time and the timing of collation does not become clear. Thus, the combination of Komori and Funakoshi will not disclose a feature of the present invention which is that a control system in which write in is performed without carrying out delay in first time and write in by performing delay after that time. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the above rejections be withdrawn.

Additionally, claims 3-4, 10, 12-13, 15, 17 and 19 depend either directly or indirectly from the independent claims discussed immediately above. Accordingly, these dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as set forth above and the rejections should be withdrawn.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: June 3, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

Raffaele A. DeMarco
Registration No.: 54,061
DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. Box 5257
New York, New York 10150-5257
(212) 527-7700
(212) 527-7701 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant